

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claim 23 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer and claims 24-28 have been added. Claims 1-22 and 24-28 are pending and under consideration. No new matter is include in this amendment.

The 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph Rejection:

At page 3 of the Office Action, claims 2 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed. The Examiner asserts that "The geometric shape of a dot is two-dimensional," however the Examiner has not cited any reference which indicates that a shape of a dot is so universally two dimensional, that it would be repugnant to the English language to describe a dot as having a third dimension. A physical dot must have a dimension in more than one plane or else the "dot" would not exist at all. Admittedly, many dots have a very small dimension in one direction, but nevertheless the dots have a dimension in more than one plane. Applicants' specification clearly presents a meaning of the word "dot," as "dot" is used to describe the present invention. In this regard, the Examiner is referred to paragraph [0030] of the specification and to FIGS. 3, 4 and 5 of the drawings, wherein "dots" are described as at least including cylindrical features (FIG. 3), square pillar features (FIG. 4) or having tapered circumferential features (FIG. 5). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

The 35 U.S.C. §102(b) Rejection:

At page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 4, 10, 11, 12, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,774,435 to Levinson. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference of each feature recited in the claim, arranged as in the claim. Levinson makes no mention of a corrugated surface. At col. 3, lines 20-21, the upper or interior surface of the substrate 30 is described as "uneven and disordered," characteristics which are contrary to the ordered features normally found in a corrugated structure.

Claims 4 and 12 are deemed to be patentable at least for similar reasons set forth above regarding claim 1.

Regarding claims 11 and 20, the Examiner asserts that since Levinson discloses fluorescent layer of zinc sulfide activated with manganese, Levinson thus discloses a sulfide having a refractive index of more than 1.6. No mention is made in Levinson of a refractive index of the zinc sulfide.

The First 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection:

At page 5 of the Office Action, claims 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Levinson as applied to claims 1 and 12 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,677,703 to Ito et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding claims 2 and 13, the Examiner asserts that a shape of the corrugated structure would be a matter of "design choice." The Examiner has not stated any motivation for modifying the Levinson according to the teachings of Ito et al. The mere fact that the substrate of Levinson could be modified to include teachings of Ito et al. does not make the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification. While Ito et al. may suggest modifying a cover plate for a liquid crystal display for a purpose of reducing reflections, Ito et al. do not suggest modifying a substrate of an electroluminescent device for a purpose of increasing light output efficiency of the electroluminescent device.

Claims 5 and 14 are deemed to be patentable at least for similar reasons set forth above regarding claims 1 and 2.

Both claims 6 and 15 recite "a pitch between corrugating members of the corrugated structure is $\lambda/4$ to 4λ of a wavelength of light produced from the fluorescent layer." The Examiner has not provided any analysis which indicates that the " λ " mentioned in col. 9, lines 8-44 has any relationship to a "wavelength of light produced by the fluorescent layer," as recited in claims 6 and 15. Further, as mentioned above with respect to claims 2 and 13, there would not have been any motivation for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have looked to a combination of Levinson and Ito et al. because Ito et al. and Levinson are directed to solving different problems.

Claims 7, 8, 16 and 17 are deemed to be patentable at least for similar reasons set forth above regarding claims 6 and 15.

The Second 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection:

At page 6 of the Office Action, claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Levinson as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,433,487 to Yamazaki. Claims 21 and 22 are deemed to be patentable at least for similar reasons set forth above regarding claim 12.

Allowable Subject Matter:

At page 7 of the Office Action, claims 3, 9 and 18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

New claims 24-28:

New claims 24-28 recite other features of the invention. Support for claims 24-28 is found in FIGS. 3, 4, 5 and 7 and the description thereof in the specification.

Conclusion:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 2/10/06

By: 

John H. Stowe
Registration No. 32,863

1400 Eye St., NW
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510